

9 Research Note 79-27

1
LEVEL
H

6 GENDER DIFFERENCES IN ORIENTATIONS TOWARD MILITARY SERVICE.

AD-A 077855

10 Faye E. Dowdell
United States Air Force

12 37

14 ARI-RN-79-27

BASIC RESEARCH

DDC
RECEIVED
DEC 7 1979
A

DDC FILE COPY

U.S. ARMY RESEARCH INSTITUTE FOR THE BEHAVIORAL AND SOCIAL SCIENCES
5001 Eisenhower Avenue, Alexandria, Virginia 22333

Office, Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel
Department of the Army

11 December 1979

79 127 100

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited.

408 010

du

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN ORIENTATIONS
TOWARD MILITARY SERVICE¹

Faye E. Dowdell
United States Air Force

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DDC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Dist	Avail and/or special
A	

INTRODUCTION

On 1 July 1973 the United States instituted the All-Volunteer Force (AVF), as opposed to conscription, as a means of supplying manpower to the Armed Forces. This change brought considerable discussion and debate among sociologists and policy makers because of a hypothesized transformation of military service from a "calling" to an occupation, and because of policy makers' concerns about a shortage of well-qualified male personnel causing greater dependence on female personnel and on less-qualified males.

Morris Janowitz has argued that military sociology is "an area in which theory has outrun empirical research."² With regard to the specific topic of women in the military, however, Mady Segal has pointed out that the research carried out in the 1970s has been driven by policy considerations, and has not been grounded in sociological theory.³ The purpose of this paper is to integrate existing data on the attitudes of young women toward the military with emerging theories of the changing nature of military service. The emerging theory concerns the transformation of military from a "calling" to an "occupation."

The United States has a history of calling on women for military service when faced with manpower shortages due to recruitment difficulties, demographic changes, or wartime mobilization. The role of women in the military is presently being redefined by policy makers, who are responding to demographic changes and more general social changes concerning the opening of traditionally masculine occupational specialties to women. Consequently, the military is attracting and enlisting women in record proportions, during a nonwar period.

The military has always been combat oriented and its promotion system favors combat experience, and thus operates to the disadvantage of women, who have been excluded from combat. The military has historically been a male domain. Thus, men, and not women, have been socialized to fill traditional

J. G.

(i.e., combat oriented) military roles. Men have historically entered military service ready to give their lives for their country. Women, lacking this role definition, may enter military service with work-related attitudes that are discrepant from our traditional image of the military. This may place them at a disadvantage within the military. Even given this disadvantage, the military may be seen by women as a fairer employer than are civilian employers.

In order to assess the orientations of women toward military service, it is first necessary to determine their perceptions of the military organization and the military subculture. Second, it is necessary to determine if the characteristics that they believe necessary for a satisfying occupation are perceived as available and obtainable in the military. Third, it is necessary to determine their perceived handicaps to success, i.e., perceptions of possible discrimination against them.

This paper presents a theoretical orientation to the problem through an understanding of a changing military as reflected by Moskos' theory of the institutional versus the occupational models of the Armed Forces.⁴ This theory is centered around the hypothesis that the military is changing from an institution (i.e., the following of a calling) to an occupation (i.e., expecting monetary rewards for services rendered). Further, an elaboration of gender role theories and their application to Moskos' model will be offered. The military is very concerned with issues of social change, and gender role definitions at this point are viewed by military policy makers as being as important as race relations issues were in the past. Women are experiencing some of the same problems with regard to military service as blacks, with women's integration lagging behind blacks by about 30 years.⁵ It is for this reason that the specific role of blacks in the military will also be reviewed.

The current state of knowledge on women's orientations toward the military, and my approach to the problem, will be discussed. Data that were collected by the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research for the "Monitoring the Future" project, including data previously analyzed by Jerald Bachman and his collaborators, will be used to describe attitudes associated with military service among high school seniors.⁶

THE MILITARY AS AN INSTITUTION

The military has historically been a unique institution with a specific mission. It provides the means of maintaining international order and control, through deterrence and constabulary operations if possible, through violence against other societies if necessary. The military is the protecting force of the United States. It is a bureaucracy with the resources for carrying out every phase of normal living. It has had many of the characteristics of a "total institution" as described by Goffman.⁷ The military offers the individual a place to sleep, play, and work in the same environment. At times, all aspects of life are conducted in the same place and under the same authority. Much of the member's daily activity is carried on in the immediate company of a large group of others. All phases of the day's activities are tightly scheduled. The various enforced activities are brought together into a single rational plan purportedly designed to fulfill the official aims of the institution. It is these characteristics described by Goffman that have placed the military in a position to also be defined as a place of residence and work where a large number of like-situated individuals lead an enclosed, formally administered round of life, usually cut off from the wider society for an appreciable period of time.

According to Moskos, the institutional model refers to the members of the organization regarding themselves as different from the society in general.

The military is an organization built on tradition. It has been recognized for many years as an institution of honor and obedience and its personnel use the military as a means of performing a duty to their country. In situations like this, little attention is paid to personal needs. Great sacrifices are made including fixed terms of enlistments, liability for twenty-four hour service availability, frequent movements of self and family, subjection to military discipline and law, inability to resign, strike, or negotiate over working conditions, and dangers inherent to military maneuvers and actual combat operations. Much of the pay for this type of sacrifice is in a noncash form, such as food, housing, and uniforms. Other pay is deferred in the form of various post-service benefits.

THE MILITARY AS AN OCCUPATION

The "just-a-job" attitude is related to the hypothesis that the military is changing from an institutional structure to an occupational structure. Moskos' occupational model varies from the institutional model by stressing the importance of monetary rewards for equivalent competencies defined by the market place. This model implies priority of self-interest rather than the interest of the employing organization.

Military pay has continuously increased since the end of the draft. It was felt that there was a need for higher monetary incentive to attract the types of quality people the military had priority in recruiting.⁸ This increase was recommended by the Gates Commission, appointed by the President in 1969 to research various aspects of an all-volunteer force. The commission, chaired by former Secretary of Defense Thomas S. Gates, Jr. submitted its report to the President in 1970 recommending higher military salaries, improved conditions of service and recruiting, and the establishment of a standby draft system.

Ending the draft and raising military pay are not the only changes that have been noted by Moskos as key factors in the trend toward the occupational model of military service. Others are various proposals to eliminate or reduce a host of military benefits, increasing the social representativeness of the ground combat arms, separation of work and residence locales, resistance of many military wives to participate in customary social functions, high rates of attrition among enlisted personnel in the post-Vietnam military, and an increasing tendency of active-duty personnel to bring grievances into litigation.

INSTITUTION VERSUS OCCUPATION

In this paper, "occupational orientation" will denote the "commitment-of-self-to-service" attitude. Segal and Blair have empirically tested the institutional-occupational model by measuring the attitudes of Army personnel.⁹ They found that soldiers considered military service and civilian jobs as alternative forms of employment. This job orientation did not preclude the soldiers from having a sense of calling also. The analysis suggested that the people in the Army may not have to choose between the two models, but might make use of both of them.

The first large scale attempt to empirically test the institutional-occupational model was conducted by Stahl, Manley, and McNichols.¹⁰ This research also suggested that the respondent could score high on both dimensions or low on both, although the overall correlation between the two dimensions was negative.

OCCUPATIONAL SOCIALIZATION

The changes in the military pay system have linked the military to a market system of remuneration. Thus, the military may be perceived as a viable alternative occupation. Moore states that the principle sorting

mechanism for the adult occupational world has come to be the school, beginning at the elementary level.¹¹ However, he believes that the selective process actually starts before school entrance.

Jonathan Turner states that males have a higher level of achievement motivation than females because of certain occupational experiences of their fathers.¹² Boys are raised to aspire to follow in their father's footsteps. The higher level of occupational status that is achieved by the father, the more motivation the son will have to achieve equal or higher status. Barry, Bacon, and Child agree that there is a widespread pattern of greater pressure toward nurturance, obedience, and responsibility in girls, and toward self-reliance and achievement striving in boys.¹³

Rosenberg and Rosenberg have observed that the younger child, when asked about the future, is likely to conceptualize himself/herself in occupational terms, e.g., "I want to be a teacher when I grow up."¹⁴ Older children will usually relate to the future in terms of some theme or value, e.g., "When I grow up, I want to have a good job and raise a family." The occupational aspirations of younger children and adolescents also differ in that younger children tend to choose more of the manual-type jobs and the older children tend to choose more of the white-collar professional positions. Rosenberg and Rosenberg have also found that there are distinct differences among the ages when controlled for sex. The main difference that was noted was that younger boys choose the manual jobs or action jobs when they are young, but as they grow older, they are inclined to choose professions that are usually given more status in our society. However, young girls will choose lower jobs on the occupational scale, but as they get older, they will continue to choose semi-professional, more traditionally female, jobs. They conclude by stating that the differences in occupational choices between males and females are a reflection of social learning. Occupational sex-typing is so prevalent

in our society that children are socialized to think that any change-over is a threat to their masculinity or femininity.¹⁵

Social learning has a great impact on the occupational choices of females. However, recent changes in technology will soon also have an impact on the socialization of work roles. The need for great body strengths will not be prevalent in most jobs. We are entering an era of "push-button control." This has affected the military in that within this institution, changes in technology caused a greater need for skill differentiation and technological sophistication,¹⁶ and perhaps a decreased need for brute strength. The shift will significantly reduce the number of traditional combat positions, thus making the military resemble other industries. These changes will encourage more females to view the military as an occupational choice.

Socialization may be viewed as a key factor in the institutional model of military service. The stages in the process of socialization are many and cover the span of various years depending on the individual's background. The question here is how this process is important in determining individual careers. Children learn by imitating adult models.¹⁷ If the only roles that a young girl is exposed to are those of mother, housewife, or some female-typed job specialty, then the child learns that society accepts this model for women and that females must refrain from even thinking of the wide array of male-typed job specialties. Males are oriented to different roles, especially regarding the military. It is the male children who play soldier. With their guns in hand, they go off to kill the enemy while the females remain behind to play with their dolls. It is not a common practice for little girls to play with tanks, submarines, and airplanes. However, it is a common practice for little boys to play with stereotypically masculine dolls (e.g., "G.I. Joe") and other war toys.

Little boys and little girls learn about war in many ways. Attitudes about war are usually formed by the time children reach adolescence. War toys, television, and role models are only some of the many ways that children learn about war. Tolley reported on a study of children, aged from seven to fifteen, and how they developed their attitudes about war.¹⁸ The media, family, and school are the main sources of information. Very few children equate war with good. Most young children's attitudes about war involve some type of pain or death. Pain and death are not on the list of the most favorable things that children want to experience. Even though wars are thought of by young children in terms of killing, they are still thought of as being necessary, at times. The only time that children perceive war as necessary is when it is conducted for national defense or against a hostile enemy. Children believe that one should be ready to give his life for his country's freedom. However, as the child grows older, at around ten or eleven years of age, he or she expresses the most disapproval of war. Older boys tolerate war better than older girls. At the early childhood stage of life, there is really no significant difference between boys' and girls' attitudes about war. There is also very little difference between children of career military personnel and other children. Attitudes about war have basically been the result of some discussion of some war that was either recently ended or still in process. Children usually learn about war as a part of their socialization process in the home.

YOUTH AND THE MILITARY

Most of the Armed Forces' recruitment programs are aimed at the young adult male in society, especially between the ages of eighteen and twenty-two. The military is an organization inhabited by a young population, but the military is now competing with colleges and civilian employment for the same cohorts. Choosing one of these three alternatives marks the end of

adolescence and the beginning of adulthood.

Campbell describes the adolescent period and youth culture as the first time the human being tries to conceptualize himself, works to change himself, and presents various images of himself before others.¹⁹ Campbell describes these processes as emergent properties of the period. They include such things as defining an expected future identity (in terms of an occupation); unlearning (putting away childish things) in socialization for the first time; coming to terms with one's dreams and making choices, for the first time realizing that some of them cannot be reversed; and a major confrontation between values and reality. Youth perceive their major function to society at this period as that of preparing for the future and independence.

The high school environment is very important at this stage because it is the first time that the individual places more importance on peers than on the family as socializing agents.²⁰ Coleman agrees and states that all activities of the adolescent center around attempting to gain approval, admiration, and respect in everyday activities, in and out of school.²¹ He also stated that boys have far more activities and leisure pursuits than do girls. Parsons states that defining roles tend to polarize the genders.²² Boys aspire to be star athletes and girls aspire to be popular within the high school environment. These aspirations are a reflection of the differentiation of adult sex roles. Parsons goes on to explain the beginning of the docile nature that is present among high school females. He states that it stems from active participation in the domestic patterns of the home. The girls pattern themselves after their mothers and imitate the "mother" role. The boys cannot imitate the father's role as precisely because his work is usually done outside of the home, where it cannot be seen. Extra pressures are placed on a boy concerning occupational aspirations because he is taught that in the future his occupational status will be the primary

source of the income and class status of his wife and children.

Youths in our society are faced with so many decisions that there is considerable strain and feelings of insecurity present during this period. Most of the indecision centers around vocational plans. Young men who are undecided on their vocational plans are more likely to enlist in military service.²³ Even though vocational indecision is a basic motive for enlistment in the Armed Forces, it is considered one of the least important ones. Johnson and Bachman state that the most important motive for military service enlistment is that the individual feels that he "fits well" into a military-type job.

By the time the child reaches adolescence, desirable job characteristics are well defined in his mind. Adolescence marks the period of trying to find an occupation which fits well with the characteristics of work that the individual places the most importance on.

BLACKS IN THE MILITARY

The military frequently prides itself on being at the forefront of social change. This was especially the case when the military set the pace in the promotion of race relations.²⁴ Blacks with limited educational backgrounds have a chance at upward mobility in the Armed Forces. Even though some studies have reported no differences in the earnings of veterans and nonveterans,²⁵ studies that controlled for race, have found that blacks experience an economic advantage as a result of the military service. Browning, Lopreato, and Poston state that the military provides conditions and opportunities for movement from one occupation to another through work experience for minority males.²⁶

Black men have not always been integrated into the Armed Forces. They have served in all of the wars in which this country has participated, and

in earlier conflicts before national independence was won, but usually in segregated units, commanded by white officers. After World War I, the Navy was the first Service to establish policies minimizing differential treatment on a racial basis. Segregation was not the only problem that blacks encountered. Mental test results of blacks were interpreted as proof of their racial inferiority, resulting in their assignment to the most menial jobs. It was not until the 1920s and 1930s that civilian social scientists began elaborate studies on blacks in the military. Subsequently, race relations have been significantly improved in the Armed Forces.²⁷

The military has, since the American and French revolutions, been looked upon as the hallmark of leadership and the credential for citizenship. First blacks had to prove themselves worthy of such a privilege, and did. Now they are enlisting in numbers that are overrepresentative of the national population.²⁸ Department of Defense statistics, as of 30 September 1977, reflect that of the 2,060,598 persons serving in the military, 330,165 (16%) are black. A further breakdown shows that nearly 18% of the total enlisted force in all Services are black, and about 4% of all officers are black. At the enlisted grades, at least, blacks are an overrepresented minority.

WOMEN IN THE MILITARY

The utilization of women in the military has paralleled, in many ways, that of blacks, with a lag of about thirty years.²⁹ Women have been "called" to serve, in noncombat capacities, in every major war that the United States has had. Even between wars, women participated in research, education, health care, and civil and domestic action programs.³⁰ During World War I, Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels challenged legislation concerning the Navy by asking if there was any law stating that a yeoman must be a man. When he

received a negative reply, the ranks were filled with women (about 12,500), nicknamed Yeomanettes, who performed well in all tasks assigned. These were the first enlisted women in the United States' Armed Forces. They filled important clerical and administrative jobs in order to release men for combat duty. Thus, the Navy took the lead in the integration of women, as it had in the integration of blacks. However, these positions were not permanent. At the signing of the Armistice on 11 November 1918, the need for women in support jobs decreased and all women were transferred to inactive status and eventually discharged. It took another major crisis, World War II, before women were allowed to serve again. This time nearly 265,000 women answered the call to free a man to fight and this time they were in the Services to stay. Women have continuously supported the military by being assigned basically to traditionally female-type jobs, such as nurses and clerks. Most of the job assignments have the same characteristics as corresponding civilian jobs, including working hours, daily tasks, and levels of responsibility. The similarity of these characteristics aids in the elimination of the idea of a special "calling" to perform the tasks since they are being performed regardless of the individual being civilian or military. However, the similarity does not eliminate a sense of service.

The military services have always focused on males as their primary source of manpower. However, the census shows a decline of males eligible for military service during the next decade. If we are to maintain a force of relatively constant size, the United States will be forced to go back to conscription or the military will be under pressure to recruit more women in the near future. When this decision has to be made, there is a strong possibility that more use will be made of women with an "orientation to military service" or wanting to serve in the Armed Forces.

In order to achieve a clearer understanding of attitudes toward women in the military, we must first consider how attitudes toward women in general are formed. Many sociologists feel that in order to anticipate the direction of social change, it is necessary to know the social position of women.³¹ Again this introduces the concept of socialization...learning what society expects of you. Society expects gender role differences. Granted that there are identifiable differences between men and women, there is no proof that these differences account for the superior positions of men relative to women in society resulting from male dominance in the political and economic spheres.³² Intensive studies of the brains of males and females cannot readily justify male superiority.³³ Binkin and Bach reported on a study prepared for the military on different characteristics of adult anthropometric and body composition in relation to physical performance, by sex, and the results were as favorable to females as to males.³⁴ Women are also proving that they can perform well in their work.

More attention has been given to working women since the beginning of the Women's Liberation Movement in the 1960s. This movement flourished after the Civil Rights Movement because it sensitized women to their second-class citizenship.³⁵

Women are beginning to demand expanded roles in the labor force. There are only a limited number of occupations that actually call for great physical strength. Women are entering jobs that have before been closed to them. The progress is gradual and, at the present, some positions are so rarely filled by women that the women filling the positions that are male-typed may appear to be totally out of place. Kanter has developed a sociological framework for conceptualizing the processes that occur between men and women in such male-typed jobs where the women constitute a very small minority.³⁶ She hypothesizes that there are three perceptual phenomena associated with such

skewed gender distributions: visibility, polarization, and assimilation. Visibility refers to the capture of a larger awareness share, and creates performance pressures. Polarization refers to the exaggeration of differences because of the application of familiar generalizations or stereotypes. It leads to isolation. Assimilation refers to the use of familiar generalizations and stereotypes about a person's social life, and it results in role entrapment: continuing to place the person in the stereotypical role. Kanter concludes that the consequences of this status include increased personal stress and unsatisfactory relations in the work situation.

By restricting women from some job specialties, and concentrating them in others, the military has limited the degree to which these phenomena have occurred. Women receive much of the same military socialization as men, especially orientation to the main mission of the Armed Forces. However, women are restricted from combat duty. As a result of the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948, statutes precluded the assignment of women to combat ships and combat aircraft. This Act was challenged by women in the U.S. Navy in the Federal District Court in Washington, D.C. in 1978. The Court found that the Women's Armed Services Integration Act of 1948 is unconstitutional and ordered the Navy to assign women to ships. The Navy complied by assigning women to ships that support combat vessels, such as submarine tenders and destroyer tenders. Even though there have been laws that exclude women from combat ships and combat aircraft, there are no laws that exclude women from ground combat units.³⁷ The exclusion of women from ground combat units is based solely on military policies and not on statutory restrictions. These statutory restrictions and military policies reflect societal opinion, and society has never supported the "right to fight" of women.³⁸ Some of the problems that the public has repeatedly posed as objections to women in combat roles are factors such as problems of living in

foxholes with men; latrine situations; baths; other personal female hygiene problems; and rape (especially among POWs).

The problems that society perceives as obstacles to the integration of women into military service have not precluded positive perceptions of the military as a mobility opportunity by female and black youth.³⁹

HYPOTHESES

The following hypotheses, that were empirically tested in this study, were derived from theories on gender-role socialization and on changing military organization:

- H1: Both males and females are likely to place more importance on the occupational type characteristics of work than the institutional type characteristics.
- H2: The difference in importance of the two types of work characteristics is expected to be greater for females than for males, i.e., females are likely to be more positively oriented than males to the occupational than the institutional type characteristics of work.
- H3: Females are expected to have a lower sense of calling than males.
- H4: Both blacks and whites are likely to perceive the military positively as a job opportunity.
- H5: White and black females will be more similar to black males than to white males in their perceptions of opportunities available to people who work in the military.
- H6: Females will be more similar to black males than to white males in their perceptions of discrimination against blacks and women who are in the Armed Forces.

- H7: Females are more likely than males to perceive fairer treatment in military service than in civilian employment.
- H8: Males are more likely than females to be positively oriented toward military service.
- H9: Males are more likely than females to be positively oriented toward long-term military service.

THE DATA BASE

The data used in this study were collected by Jerald G. Bachman and Lloyd D. Johnson through a currently ongoing project, "Monitoring the Future,"⁴⁰ conducted at the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research. Bachman describes this project as a series of annual national surveys of approximately 18,000 seniors in 125 high schools, selected to be nationally representative. This is a panel study that began with the graduating class of 1975.

The project employs five different questionnaire forms, from which the indicators were drawn, to measure attitude change. The data presented here are data from one form administered to the high school class of 1977 in the spring of their senior year. There are about 3,600 seniors in this sample.

This sample is representative of the nation's high school senior population in that there are 49% males, 51% females, 86% white, and 14% black in the weighted sample.

RESULTS

Many of the data have been previously analyzed by Bachman and his collaborators. These analyses of the data provide both multivariate and bivariate frequency distributions of the variables specified in the theory, as well as some correlation analyses.

Each hypothesis was tested individually beginning with the first: Both males and females are likely to place more importance on the occupational type characteristics of work than the institutional type characteristics.

Table 1 presents the means of the responses to questions used to indicate the occupational and institutional characteristics of work. In a difference of means test (two-tailed), all occupational items except one are significantly different from each institutional item at the .005 level. For males, three of the occupational items were significantly greater than all four institutional items. For females this was true for only one occupational item. The means of the responses of each item were added together to form an average of the means, i.e., after the mean was computed for each item, the means of the four items of each characteristic of work were averaged together. This average of the means of these two types of work characteristics indicate that males are more occupationally oriented toward work than institutionally oriented toward work. Females are about equal in their occupational and institutional work orientations. Thus, the first hypothesis is supported for males, but not for females.

The second hypothesis states that the difference in importance of the two types of work characteristics is expected to be greater for females than for males. It can be seen from Table 1 that females are more oriented to the institutional characteristics of work, than males, and less oriented than males to the occupational characteristics of work. Therefore the hypothesis is not supported.

Looking at the gender differences in importance of institutional characteristics of work, females are higher than the males on three of the four items. Two of these differences are significant. On this set

of four questions that characterize the presence of an institutional orientation, females place more importance on a job that offers an opportunity to help others and one that is worthwhile to society than do the males. Males however, place more importance on status and prestige, and this difference is significant.

Males are slightly higher than females in rating the importance of all the occupational characteristics. Both males and females indicate the importance of a job that offers chances for advancement and promotion, money, and security; and relatively little importance on time off (i.e., a vacation) from the job. All items are significant except the item "a job that offers a reasonably predictable, secure future,"

Historically, the institutional model has been linked with commitment to military service, especially in times of war. Therefore a more valid measure of the institutional orientation to military service will be indicated by the degree of sense of calling. The third hypothesis states that females are expected to have a lower sense of calling than males. Table 2 presents, for each subgroup, the percentage who say they are likely to volunteer for military service in case of war. Almost equal percentages of white males would volunteer for military service in the event of war as would not volunteer for military service. This is different for white females, black males, and black females. Even controlling for race, females are less likely than males in both groups to have positive responses to volunteering. White males are significantly more likely to feel that they would volunteer than are all other groups. Black males are also significantly more likely than either black or white females. In this case, the hypothesis is supported.

The hypothesis that both blacks and whites are likely to perceive the

military as a job opportunity will be tested by measuring what opportunities are perceived to be available to people who work in the military. Table 3 lists a set of opportunities and the percentages of each subgroup indicating their perceptions of the availability of that opportunity to those working in the military. Of the opportunity items, a chance to get more education is indicated as the opportunity that is most perceived as being available to military service personnel. A chance to advance to a more responsible position is indicated as the second most favorable item of job opportunities. As indicated in Table 1, this item is shown to be one of the main characteristics that youth look for in a job. Table 3 indicates opportunity for advancement to be highly perceived as available to those working in the military. However, on the other items, only minorities, or relatively small majorities, see opportunity available in the military. Support for this hypothesis is mixed.

The fifth hypothesis states that white and black females will be more similar to black males than to white males in their perceptions of opportunities available to people who work in the military. In four out of five items, this hypothesis is supported. However, on the fifth item, chance to get their ideas heard, white females are significantly different from white males and from black males and females in their perceptions of that specific opportunity being available to people who work in the military. Looking at Table 3 we can see that on all items, black females have more positive perceptions of job opportunities in the military than do the other subgroups. On three of the five items, black males are second to black females. White females are more similar to blacks than to white males in their perceptions of available opportunities. White males perceive less opportunities available to people who work in the military than any other subgroup.

Table 4 presents the percentages of each subgroup's perceptions of discrimination against black people and against women who are in the Armed Forces. Testing the sixth hypothesis, which states that females will be similar to black males in their perceptions of discrimination against people who are in the Armed Forces, yields some interesting results. Blacks are more likely than whites to perceive discrimination against black people ($\gamma=.468$) and against women who are in the Armed Forces ($\gamma=.415$). White females are not significantly different from white males in the perceptions of discrimination against blacks in the military. Therefore, the hypothesis is not supported. Rather we find that blacks are more likely than whites to perceive discrimination against both blacks and women, and women are more likely than men to perceive discrimination against women.

The next hypothesis to be tested is that females are more likely than males to perceive fairer treatment in military service than in civilian employment. Table 5 presents the percentages of each subgroup's perceptions of fairer treatment in the military or in civilian employment. Blacks, more so than whites, expressed perceptions of fairer treatment in the military than in civilian employment. The differences are quite different when controlling for gender. White females and black males are more likely than white males and black females to perceive fairer treatment in the military service. However, females are less likely than males to perceive fairer treatment in civilian employment. The hypothesis is only supported when comparing the attitudes of black females and white males.

As hypothesized, among whites, males are more likely than females to be positively oriented toward military service, as can be seen from Table 6. This analysis has previously been reported by Bachman.⁴¹ There is a greater percentage of females that desire military service than think that serving in

the Armed Forces is likely. An equal percentage of white males indicate that they want military service and that it is likely that they will serve. A larger percentage of black males perceive themselves as serving in the Armed Forces than actually want to serve. This hypothesis is supported within racial groups. The major effect, however, seems to be race rather than gender, with blacks having higher desires ($\gamma=.421$) and expectations ($\gamma=.495$) of military service.

The final hypothesis tested was that males are more likely than females to be oriented toward long-term military service. Table 7 presents the percentages of males and females who indicated an expectation of being in the military service when they are thirty years old. These data are from the 1975, rather than the 1977, base-year survey. This analysis was reported by Blair.⁴² A greater percentage of males than females expect to be in military service at age thirty. This hypothesis is also supported.

CONCLUSIONS

Males and females have varying perceptions of military organization and the military subculture. The traditional image of the military, the following of a "calling," is discrepant with the attitudes of youth today. Moskos explained this discrepancy as a consequence of a changing military structure, resembling more a civilian employer than a military institution. Moskos' institution-occupation model was tested in this study by measuring the attitudes of a sample of high school seniors, representative of the nation's population, on a set of items that were indicators of the characteristics of each model.

Males are more likely than females to view the military as a calling even though they placed more importance on the occupational characteristics (i.e., advancement, money, vacation, and security) than the institutional characteristics (i.e., prestige, helping others, worth to society, and respect)

of work. The occupational and institutional characteristics of work that are analyzed in this study reflect the type of things that youth look for in any job. However, it can be clearly seen that the military institution is not equated with other jobs in terms of the goals of the organization by all youths. The military organization is related to the waging of war, and this is recognized by many of our respondents. Over half of the respondents in this study would not volunteer for military service in case of war. The youth in this study were politically socialized during the Vietnam era, which was a time of high anti-war sentiment. As long as there is no threat of a possible war, however, the military may be viewed as an occupational alternative, as opposed to a calling.

The same type of socialization that has defined the role of the military as the waging of war has defined the role of soldier as appropriate for men. This accounts for the low percentage of females that volunteer for military service if a war were likely in the future. Females have a very low sense of calling even though they have a higher institutional orientation to work than males, possibly as a result of gender-role socialization. Historically, females have been limited to the roles defined by society as suitable for nonmales. More often, these roles were those of housewife, mother, and if employed, female-typed jobs (e.g., secretary, nurse, teacher, etc.). All of those roles have some type of service-to-others orientation. This type of dedication to others, instead of self, may account for the high level of institutional characteristics displayed by the females sampled. Females have been learning to work for others for so long that it is not unlikely for this attitude to be displayed by this female sample. This is not to say that females are only interested in helping others. Our data show that a job where the chances of advancement and promotion are good and a job that offers a

reasonably predictable, secure future are equally desired with a job that gives them an opportunity to be directly helpful to others.

The characteristics that both males and females believe necessary for a satisfying occupation are perceived as available and obtainable to some degree in the military. One-half or more of all respondents perceive people who work in the military to have a chance to get more education. This is consistent with the analyses that have encouraged the use of educational incentives to recruit high quality personnel.⁴³ However, less than half of all respondents perceive the people working in the military as having a chance to get their ideas heard or a chance to get ahead. This low perception of people working in the military getting their ideas heard may be a result of the socialized perception of the authoritarian nature of military service. Changing the pay system in the military has made it more attractive to young potential recruits looking to get ahead, but what price can you really place on independence? It has been indicated in this study that money is not the number one motivator for taking any job among high school seniors. The mission of the Armed Forces has not made enough significant changes to eliminate the possibility of losing one's life in battle. Females have been socialized mostly to save lives, not take them. Since social learning has the greatest impact on occupational choices, it stands to reason that the military would not be very high on the list of job options for females.

The image of the military has yet to appeal to the majority of women in our society today. Military maneuvers and combat operations are not the types of daily tasks that women, nor men, look for in a job. Combat boots and fatigues never get advertising space in the fashion magazines that denote the "in" thing to wear for the year. Women are traditionally more family oriented. Therefore, the possibility of prolonged absence from the family and loved ones, in a strange town or country, may be viewed as a traumatic

experience for women.

The subordinate place of women in the present social order has always been noted by social scientists.⁴⁴ The generally subordinate role of women has led to discrimination against women in the labor force. Even though many opportunities are perceived to be present for those working in the military service, there is still the question of perceptions of discrimination standing in the way of these opportunities. Discrimination has traditionally been a major hindrance in the advancement to certain positions by women, yet only a small percentage of the respondents perceived discrimination against women who are in the Armed Forces. Over one-third of the black females perceived discrimination against black people and against women who are in the Armed Forces. It is the black female who has suffered the most discrimination in our present society. Even though there is a large percentage of black females who think that there is discrimination against black people and women who are in the Armed Forces, they still perceive the military as being a fairer employer than the civilian labor force. The black female perceives even greater discrimination against black people and women who are not in the Armed Forces. Blacks have a higher perception of fairer treatment as a member of the Armed Forces than do whites. Whites perceive themselves as being treated more fairly as civilians than as members of the Armed Forces.

Blacks are more positively oriented toward military service than whites, and males are more positively oriented toward military service than females. If discrimination is not seen as a major hindrance toward women serving in the Armed Forces, then there must be some other reason or reasons for the small percentage wanting to serve in the military and the even smaller percentage who think that it is likely that they will serve in the military. The percentage of white males who want to serve in the military is equal to the

percentage who think that it is likely that they will serve in the military. It is interesting to note that only the black males have a higher percentage of respondents who think that it is likely that they will serve in the military even if they really do not want to serve in the military. This may be a result of the high unemployment rates for black males in the civilian labor force.

White males would be more willing than black males to volunteer for military service in case of war ($\gamma=.197$). However, blacks are more likely to desire ($\gamma=.310$) or think it likely ($\gamma=.601$) that they will serve in the Armed Forces when there is not a "necessary" war than whites. It is clear to see that these high school seniors have developed attitudes about the military as having a unique mission in society instead of being merely an occupational alternative.

The indicators used in this study to measure institutional and occupational orientations to work were based on general questions prepared for the Monitoring the Future Project. Analysis of institutional and occupational orientations could be greatly improved upon if the questions were specifically related to military organization instead of general employment preferences. Moskos used specific characteristics to identify both institutional and occupational structures in his model. Moskos' institutional structure and occupational structure could be measured better via responses to the perceptions of the availability of certain characteristics within the military organization specifically.

Table 1. Mean Responses to Occupational and Institutional Characteristics Indicators, by Gender

<u>Occupational Items</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Gamma*</u>
A job where the chances of advancement and promotion are good	3.56	3.45	.130
A job which provides you with a chance to earn a good deal of money	3.43	3.25	.211
A job where you have more than two weeks vacation	2.60	2.23	.272
A job that offers a reasonably predictable, secure future	3.56	3.54	.043
<u>Institutional Items</u>			
A job that has high status and prestige	2.77	2.65	.092
A job that gives you an opportunity to be directly helpful to others	3.09	3.52	-.423
A job that is worthwhile to society	3.15	3.37	-.223
A job that most people look up to and respect	2.99	3.02	-.028

Ns for males vary from 1401 to 1409, for females from 1607 to 1614.

*Gamma for table with the item as a 4-point scale cross-classified by gender. A positive gamma indicates that males were more likely than females to consider the characteristic important; a negative gamma indicates greater importance of the characteristic for females than males.

Table 2. Subgroup Percentages of Likelihood of Volunteering for
Military Service in a "Necessary" War, by Race and Gender

	<u>White</u>			<u>Black</u>		
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Gamma</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Gamma</u>
Positive responses*	42	20	-.488	33	20	-.321
Negative responses	41	53		51	55	
N	(973)	(1132)		(107)	(165)	

Significance of paired comparisons for positive responses

White males vs. white females	.05
White males vs. black males	.05
White males vs. black females	.05
White females vs. black males	.05
White females vs. black females	n.s.
Black males vs. black females	.05

Respondents who chose the response alternative "There is no such thing as a 'necessary' war" are omitted from the Table. Percentages who chose this response, by category, were: white males 17%; white females 27%; black males 16%; black females 25%. Including these figures in the computations reduces the gammas slightly.

Table 3. Subgroup Percentages of Perceived Opportunities Available to People Who Work in the Military, by Race and Gender

<u>Item</u>	<u>White</u>			<u>Black</u>		
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Gamma</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Gamma</u>
Chance to get ahead	27 (1003)	38 (1150)	.247	42 (107)	47 (177)	.098
Chance to get more education	50 (1003)	64 (1150)	.274	67 (104)	72 (177)	.105
Chance to advance to a more responsible position	46 (999)	61 (1146)	.294	54 (103)	72 (175)	.367
Chance to have a personally more fulfilling job	33 (995)	59 (1152)	.491	49 (105)	63 (176)	.288
Chance to get their ideas heard	17 (990)	26 (1130)	.265	39 (102)	49 (174)	.194

Significance of paired comparisons for positive responses

	<u>Get Ahead</u>	<u>Educ- tion</u>	<u>Respon- sibility</u>	<u>Fulfill- ment</u>	<u>Ideas</u>
White males vs. white females	.05	.05	.05	.05	.05
White males vs. black males	.05	.05	n.s.	.05	.05
White males vs. black females	.05	.05	.05	.05	.05
White females vs. black males	n.s.	n.s.	n.s.	.05	.05
White females vs. black females	.05	.05	.05	n.s.	.05
Black males vs. black females	n.s.	n.s.	.05	.05	n.s.

Table 4. Subgroup Percentages of Perceived Discrimination in the Armed Services, by Race and Gender

<u>Item</u>	<u>White</u>			<u>Black</u>		
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Gamma</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Gamma</u>
Perceived discrimination against black people who are in the armed services	9 (981)	9 (1128)	.004	24 (106)	37 (173)	.311
Perceived discrimination against women who are in the armed services	13 (983)	19 (1125)	.222	25 (105)	36 (174)	.266

Significance of paired comparisons

	<u>Black People</u>	<u>Women</u>
White males vs. white females	n.s.	.05
White males vs. black males	.05	.05
White males vs. black females	.05	.05
White females vs. black males	.05	n.s.
White females vs. black females	.05	.05
Black males vs. black females	.05	.05

Table 5. Sugroup Percentages of Perceived Fair Treatment, by Race and Gender

<u>Item</u>	<u>White</u>			<u>Black</u>		
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Gamma</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Gamma</u>
Fairer treatment as a member of the military service	16 (982)	20 (1130)	-.154	34 (104)	28 (168)	-.159
Fairer treatment as a civilian	39 (982)	21 (1130)		19 (104)	15 (168)	

Significance of paired comparisons

	<u>Fairer in Military</u>	<u>Fairer in Civilian</u>
White males vs. white females	.05	.05
White males vs. black males	.05	.05
White males vs. black females	.05	.05
White females vs. black males	.05	n.s.
White females vs. black females	.05	.05
Black males vs. black females	n.s.	n.s.

Table 6. Subgroup Percentages of Positive Orientations Toward Military Service, by Race and Gender

<u>Item</u>	<u>White</u>			<u>Black</u>		
	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Gamma</u>	<u>Male</u>	<u>Female</u>	<u>Gamma</u>
Want to serve in the armed forces	14 (1098)	7 (1240)	-.368	24 (131)	21 (210)	-.078
Likelihood of serving in the armed forces	14 (1046)	4 (1159)	-.594	39 (109)	12 (186)	-.659

Significance of paired comparisons

	<u>Want to Serve</u>	<u>Likely to Serve</u>
White males vs. white females	.05	.05
White males vs. black males	.05	.05
White males vs. black females	.05	n.s.
White females vs. black males	.05	.05
White females vs. black females	.05	.05
Black males vs. black females	n.s.	.05

Table 7. Percent Indicating that They Expect to be in Military Service When They are 30 Years Old by Likelihood of Military Service After High School and Sex of Respondent

<u>Likelihood of Military Service After High School:</u>	<u>Male Percent</u>	<u>Female Percent</u>
Definitely won't	0.0	0.1
Probably won't	0.0	0.0
Probably will	3.7	1.6
Definitely will	57.2	32.6
(Total Indicating Military Service at Age 30)	(6.6)	(1.0)

Source: John Blair "Emerging Youth Attitudes and the Military," Table 6.

FOOTNOTES

1. Paper prepared for the Southeast Regional Conference of the Inter-University Seminar on Armed Forces and Society and Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama, June 3-5, 1979. This paper is based upon the author's Master of Arts thesis, directed by Professor David R. Segal, at the University of Maryland. Dr. Jerald G. Bachman generously allowed me access to his data. I am also grateful to Professors Mady W. Segal and John D. Blair for their assistance and encouragement. This research was supported in part by the U.S. Army Research Institute for the Behavioral and Social Sciences under Grant #DAHC-19-77-G-0011. The views expressed herein are the author's own, and do not necessarily reflect those of the Department of the Army or the Department of the Air Force.
2. Morris Janowitz, "Preface," in Handbook of Military Institutions, ed. by Roger W. Little (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1971), p.5.
3. Mady W. Segal, "Women in the Military: Research and Policy Issues," Youth and Society, X (December, 1978):101-126.
4. Charles C. Moskos, Jr., "From Institution to Occupation," Armed Forces and Society, IV (November, 1977):41-50.
5. David R. Segal, Nora Scott Kinzer, and John C. Woelfel, "The Concept of Citizenship and Attitudes toward Women in Combat," Sex Roles, III (October, 1977):469-477.
6. Jerald G. Bachman, "High School Seniors' Plans, Preferences, and Attitudes about Military Service: Differences Linked to Sex and Race," (unpublished paper, University of Michigan, 1978); John D. Blair, "Emerging Youth Attitudes and the Military," in The Changing World of the American Military, ed. by Franklin D. Margiotta. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1975), pp. 155-177; David R. Segal and Jerald G. Bachman, "The Military as an Educational and Training Institution," Youth and Society, X (September, 1978):47-64; David R. Segal, Jerald G. Bachman, and Faye E. Dowdell, "Military Service for Female and Black Youth," Youth and Society, X (December, 1978):127-134.
7. Erving Goffman, Asylums (Garden City: Doubleday, 1961).
8. Morris Janowitz, Military Conflict (Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1975).
9. David R. Segal and John D. Blair, "The Decline of the Citizen-Soldier," (paper presented to the Research Committee on Armed Forces and Society of the International Sociological Association, Ninth World Congress of Sociology, Uppsala, Sweden, August, 1978).

10. Michael J. Stahl, T. Roger Manley, and Charles W. McNichols, "Operationalizing the Moskos Institution-Occupation Model." Journal of Applied Psychology, LXIII (1978):422-427.
11. Wilbert E. Moore, "Occupational Socialization," in Handbook of Socialization Theory and Research, ed. by David A. Goslin (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1969), pp. 861-884.
12. Jonathan H. Turner, "Entrepreneurial Environments and the Emergence of Achievement Motivation in Adolescent Males," in Socialization, ed. by Edward Z. Dager (Chicago: Markham, 1971), pp. 110-132.
13. Herbert Barry, III, Margaret K. Bacon, and Irvin L. Child, "A Cross-Cultural Survey of Some Sex Differences in Socialization," in ibid, pp. 96-109.
14. Morris Rosenberg and Florence Rosenberg, "The Occupational Self: A Developmental Study" (paper presented to the Self-Concept Symposium, Boston, Massachusetts, September, 1978).
15. ibid.
16. Jerald G. Bachman, John D. Blair, and David R. Segal, The All-Volunteer Force (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1977).
17. Laurel Richardson Walum, The Dynamics of Sex and Gender (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1977).
18. Howard Tolley, Jr., Children and War (New York: Teachers College Press, 1973).
19. Ernest Q. Campbell, "Adolescent Socialization," in David A. Goslin, op. cit., pp. 821-860.
20. ibid.
21. James S. Coleman, The Adolescent Society (New York: Free Press, 1961).
22. Talcott Parsons, "Age and Sex in the Social Structure of the United States." American Sociological Review, VII (1942):604-616.
23. Jerome Johnson and Jerald G. Bachman, Youth in Transition, Vol. 5 (Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, 1972).
24. Morris Janowitz, Military Conflict.
25. W. M. Mason, On the Socio-Economic Effects of Military Service (unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Chicago, 1970); Phillips Cutright, "The Civilian Earnings of White and Black Draftees and Non-veterans," American Sociological Review, XXXIX (June, 1974):317-327.

26. Harley L. Browning, Sally C. Lopreato, and Dudley L. Poston, "Income and Veteran Status," American Sociological Review, XXXVIII (February, 1973):74-85.
27. Charles H. Coates and Roland J. Pellegrin, Military Sociology (University Park: The Social Science Press, 1965).
28. Janowitz, Military Conflict.
29. Segal, Kinzer, and Woelfel, op. cit.
30. Department of Defense, Women in the Armed Forces (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1976).
31. Oliver C. Cox, Caste, Class, and Race (Garden City: Doubleday, 1948).
32. Walum, op. cit.
33. Carol Tavris and Carole Offir, The Longest War: Sex Differences in Perspective (New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1977).
34. Martin Binkin and Shirley J. Bach, Women and the Military (Washington: The Brookings Institution, 1977).
35. Walum, op. cit.
36. Rosabeth Moss Kanter, "Some Effects of Proportions of Group Life: Skewed Sex Ratios and Responses to Token Women," American Journal of Sociology 82 (March, 1977):965-990.
37. Binkin and Bach, op. cit.
38. Segal, Kinzer, and Woelfel, op. cit.
39. Segal, Bachman, and Dowdell, op. cit.
40. Jerald G. Bachman and Lloyd D. Johnson, "Monitoring the Future: A Research and Reporting Series on the Drug Use and Lifestyles of American Youth," (unpublished paper, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, 1978).
41. Bachman, "High School Seniors' Plans, Preferences, and Attitudes about Military Service."
42. Blair, "Emerging Youth Attitudes and the Military."
43. Segal and Bachman, op. cit.
44. Robert Staples, Introduction to Black Sociology (San Francisco: McGraw-Hill, 1976).